



## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/796,441	03/08/2004	Michael Radomsky	DEPYP003D1C1	1814
22434 7	590 10/19/2005		EXAMINER	
BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS LLP			HENRY, MICHAEL C	
P.O. BOX 702:	<del>-</del> <del>-</del>		ARTIRUT	DADED MINORD
OAKLAND, (	CA 94612-0250		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1623	

DATE MAILED: 10/19/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

ò	Application No.	Applicant(s) RADOMSKY, MICHAEL	
Advisory Action	10/796,441		
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Michael C. Henry	1623	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	Iress
THE REPLY FILED 31 August 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS A	APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR	R ALLOWANCE.	
<ol> <li>The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or of this application, applicant must timely file one of the folked places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a N (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in composition of the periods:</li> <li>The period for reply expires</li></ol>	owing replies: (1) an amendment, a otice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in oliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The rep	iffidavit, ör other evid compliance with 37 (	ence, which CFR 41.31; or
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adverse, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later the	visory Action, or (2) the date set forth in th		er is later. In no
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b) MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(	). ONLY CHECK BOX (Ь) WHEN THE F Г).	IRST REPLY WAS FILE	D WITHIN TWO
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension a CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened st above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three month earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).  NOTICE OF APPEAL	and the corresponding amount of the fee. atutory period for reply originally set in the	The appropriate extension final Office action; or (2)	on fee under 37 as set forth in (b)
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in com of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any solution in Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must AMENDMENTS	extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)	), to avoid dismissal	of the appeal.
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection.  (a) They raise new issues that would require further co.  (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below.	onsideration and/or search (see NC ow);	TE below);	
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in be appeal; and/or			j the issues for .
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a))		ejected claims.	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.		ompliant Amendmen	t (PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s		timely filed amond-	nont consoling
<ol> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a the non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>	allowable ii submilled in a separate	, umery med amendn	nent canceling
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proof the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		vill be entered and an	explanation of

## AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_ Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_ Claim(s) rejected: \_\_\_\_

- 8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will <u>not</u> be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
- 9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
- 10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

## REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_

- 11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

  <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u>
- 12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s).
- 13. Other:

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The rejection in the previous Office Action is maintained. The applicant's arguments are not found be convincing. Applicant argues that the current claims call not for merely an excipient, but an excipient that maintains the biological activity of the growth factor at the site of application. Such excipients comprise buffer salts, sugars, anti-oxidants or preservatives. See page 3, lines 4-7, of the specification. In Examples 1-5 in the present application, the hyaluronic acid-gpowth factor compositions of the invention used in the experiments all contain sugar, sodium citrate and EDTA. However, in the absence of evidence to the contrary which excludes water as an excepient that provide the properties of maintaining the biological activity of the growth factor at the site of application applicant claim includes other excipients such as water. Applicant argues that Finkenaur does not teach that water alone is such an excipient. Therefore, the composition in the example 4 of Finkenaur, relied upon by the examiner, fails to meet this requirement. However the claim 11 recites a "composition comprising" said ingredients or components and consequently does not exclude other excipients. The applicant argues that there is no motivation in Brismar, nor in Dunstan, to modify the compositions of Dunstan by addition of hyaluronic acid. However, the combination of compounds that are used to treat the same diseases or condition are well known in the art. More specifically, it is obvious to combine individual compositions taught to have the same utility to form a new composition for the very same purpose. In re Kerkhoven, 626 F.2d 846, 205 U.S.P.Q. 1069 (C.C.P.A. 1980). It should be noted that aplicant has provided showing of unexpected results for said composition.

SAMUEL BARTS
PRIMARY EXAMINER
GROUP 1200